IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

CAUSE NO. 2014-01190

APACHE CORPORATION	§	
V.	§ §	CIVIL ACTION NO
GREAT AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY	§ § §	

INDEX OF MATTERS BEING FILED

- 1. Notice of Removal
- 2. Court's Record in Cause No. 2014-01190; Apache Corporation v. Great American Insurance Company; 165th Judicial District Court of Harris County, Texas/
 - Original Petition
 - Case Information Sheet
 - Civil Process Request
 - Civil Case Information Sheet
 - Docket Sheet
- 3. List of All Counsel of Record
- 4. Proof of Service



LIST OF COUNSEL OF RECORD

Counsel for Plaintiff Apache Corporation

Patrick W. Mizell State Bar No. 14233980 Deborah Milner State Bar No. 24065761 Vinson & Elkins, LLP 1001 Fannin St., Suite 2300 Houston, TX 77002 Telephone: 713-758-2932

Telephone: 713-758-2932 Facsimile: 713-615-5912

Nancy R. Kornegay State Bar No. 24032641 Brown & Kornegay LLP 2777 Allen Parkway, Suite 977 Houston, TX 77019 Telephone: 713-528-3700

Facsimile: 713-528-3701

Counsel for Defendant Great American Insurance Company Products, Inc.

Martin S. Schexnayder
Texas Bar No. 17745610
Southern District of Texas Bar No. 15146
Winget, Spadafora & Schwartzberg, LLP
Two Riverway, Suite 725
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: 713-343-9200

Facsimile: 713-343-9201 Schexnayder.M@wssllp.com

Case 4:14-cv-00237 Document 1-1 Filed in TXSD on 02/03/14 Page 3 of 15

Marty Schexnayder

From: Marty Schexnayder

Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 9:15 AM

To: 'pmizell@velaw.com'

Subject: Apache v. Great American; 2014-01190

Pat:

This will confirm that the undersigned has been retained to represent Great American Insurance Company (GAIC) in this matter and that I am authorized to accept service on behalf of GAIC. We can agree that service is effective today.

I look forward to working with you on this matter.

Regards,

Martin S. Schexnayder
Winget, Spadafora & Schwartzberg, LLP
2 Riverway, Suite 725
Houston, TX 77056
(713) 343-9210 (o)
(713) 907-9393 (m)
schexnayder.m@wssllp.com

Winget | Spadafora | Schwartzberg | LLP www.WSSLLP.com NY - CT - NJ - FL - CA- TX

1/15/2014 2:58:13 PM Chris Daniel - District செல்கி இன்று Chris Daniel - District செல்கி இரிந்தில் ERVERO இரி (Section 2018) By: Shanelle Taylor

CAUSE NO. 2014 - 01190

APACHE CORPORATION, Plaintiff,	9 9 9	IN THE 165th
ν.	§ §	JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF
GREAT AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendant	\$ \$ \$	HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

ORIGINAL PETITION

Plaintiff Apache Corporation files this Original Petition against Great American Insurance Company and would respectfully show the Court as follows:

I. DISCOVERY CONTROL PLAN

This case should proceed as a Level 2 case pursuant to Rule 190.3 of the Texas
 Rules of Civil Procedure.

II. NATURE OF THE CASE

2. This is an action for breach of contract brought by an insured under a crime protection policy against its insurer.

III. PARTIES

- 3. Apache Corporation ("Apache") is a Delaware corporation with its address at 2000 Post Oak Boulevard, Suite 100, Houston, Texas 77056-4400.
- 4. Great American Insurance Company ("GAIC") is a corporation with its headquarters at 301 E. 4th Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45202. GAIC can be served through its registered agent, CT Corporation System, 350 N. St. Paul Street, Dallas, TX 75201. See TEX. INS. CODE § 804.103.

IV. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over GAIC because it does business in Texas; specifically, GAIC is licensed to and does sell insurance in Texas, including selling the policy at issue to Apache. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this lawsuit because the relief Plaintiff seeks is within the jurisdictional limits of this Court.
- 6. Venue is proper in Harris County because GAIC has an office in Harris County and because Apache resides in Harris County. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Ann. § 15.002(a)(3)-(4).

V. FACTS

A. Apache's Crime Protection Insurance Policy from GAIC

- 7. Apache purchased insurance from Defendant GAIC, which, in exchange for a substantial premium, undertook to insure Apache against a variety of risks, including employee dishonesty, forgery or alteration, and, at issue in this dispute, computer fraud. Specifically, Apache purchased from GAIC a Crime Protection Policy, namely, policy number SAA 2687737 0900 (the "Policy"), effective from October 1, 2012 to October 1, 2013.
- 8. Under the Computer Fraud coverage, the Policy provides \$10 million in coverage above a \$1 million per occurrence deductible. Section B.5 of the Policy states:

5. Computer Fraud

We will pay for loss of, and loss from damage to, money, securities and other property resulting directly from the use of any computer to fraudulently cause a transfer of that property from inside the premises or banking premises:

- a. to a person (other than a messenger) outside those premises; or
- b. to a place outside those premises.

B. Apache Lost Approximately \$2.4 Million As a Direct Result of Computer Fraud

- 9. On March 27, 2013, Steph Fraser, an Apache North Seas accounts payable employee, received a call from an individual claiming to be Emily Hebditch. Ms. Hebditch was an employee of Petrofac Facilities Management Limited ("Petrofac"), a vendor doing considerable work for Apache. "Ms. Hebditch" contended that Petrofac needed to change its banking information for payments from Apache. Ms. Fraser explained that such a request would need to come on Petrofac letterhead and would have to go through the account change process as she could not accept changes to payment instructions over the telephone.
- 10. In response to this conversation, Apache received an email conveying further information and attaching the requested letterhead document. The email came from an address that appeared to be a legitimate Petrofac email, and the letter was on what appeared to be legitimate Petrofac letterhead. The letter contained the correct current banking information from Petrofac and requested that future payments to Petrofac be sent to an account at Co-Operative Bank ("Co-Op Bank").
- 11. The email and letterhead were routed to another Apache employee, Muriel Kelman, on April 3, 2013. Ms. Kelman verified the request by calling the number provided on the correspondence. Someone identifying himself as Cameron Reith answered Ms. Kelman's call and confirmed the change of account information. Cameron Reith's name appears on Petrofac invoices. After this verbal confirmation, the change request was put through the vendor change request SharePoint site and approved by Susan Greig, Apache North Sea Financial Accounting Manager. However, Ms. Kelman would not have initiated the change by telephone alone; pursuant to Apache's policies, all changes to vendor payment instructions must be in writing.

- 12. Prior to the exchanges on March 28th and April 3rd, Apache had been submitting funds to Petrofac's bank account at the Royal Bank of Scotland ("RBS"). The fraudulent emailed documents requested that the funds due to Petrofac now be made to an account at Co-Op Bank. The fraudulent documents contained the correct RBS routing information for the original bank account. In addition to this fraudulent document sent by email, the fraudsters carried out their deception by using an email address that appeared to be a legitimate Petrofac email address. Had the email come from an address that did not appear to be a Petrofac account, Apache would not have made payments to the Co-Op Bank account.
- 13. Based on the data provided in the email, Apache processed invoices and remitted payment to the fraudulent bank account via electronic funds transfer. The fraudsters' fraudulent email caused Apache to transfer funds from inside the banking premises to a place outside those premises.
- 14. Apache discovered the fraud on May 3, 2013, when representatives from Petrofac informed Apache by telephone that they had not been paid for a number of outstanding invoices for engineering and construction services. Petrofac also confirmed that its account had not been transferred to Co-Op Bank and that it made no such authorization to change banking instructions. Apache immediately notified the police in Aberdeen, Scotland by telephone and followed up with emails describing the incident. The Aberdeen police directed Apache to the Financial Investigation Unit of Police Scotland, which was able to get the account frozen on Sunday, May 5, 2013.
- 15. In total, Apache paid the fraudulent bank account approximately \$7 million USD (amounts were paid in British pounds) over the course of a month. Each of these payments was

for engineering and construction services provided by Petrofac. The amounts paid by date are as follows:

April 4, 2013	£78,052.29
April 11, 2013	£1,595,484.03
April 16, 2013	£62,730.73
April 23, 2013	£496,848.01
April 25, 2013	£526,037.22
April 29, 2013	£8,760.00
April 30, 2013	£1,466,544.60
May 1, 2013	£45,333.68

An additional payment of £192,635.26 was made on May 2, 2013, but this payment was able to be recalled on May 3, 2013. Due to the efforts of Apache's bank, RBS, Apache was able to recoup some of the funds. On June 4, 2013, RBS received £2,799,433.24 from Co-Op Bank for Apache's behalf, reducing Apache's loss to £1,573,454.96 or, roughly, \$2.4 million.

16. Apache also notified the appropriate authorities, who conducted an investigation. The authorities believe that the crime was perpetrated by criminals residing in Latvia. There has been no success in finding the funds that were wired out from the Co-Operative Bank. There are no funds left in the accounts to which funds from the Co-Op Bank were transferred.

C. GAIC Denied Apache's Claim Under the Policy

17. Based on this criminal activity and computer fraud, Apache suffered a loss of £1,573,454.96 or, roughly, \$2.4 million. On May 10, 2013, Apache notified GAIC of the loss. On August 22, 2013, Apache submitted to GAIC a detailed, sworn proof of loss. Apache cooperated fully with GAIC in its investigation of Apache's claim.

18. On October 28, 2013, GAIC denied coverage for Apache's loss. GAIC claimed that the loss "did not result directly from the use of a computer nor did the use of the computer cause the transfer of funds" because an Apache employee confirmed the information in the fraudulent email by telephone.

VI. COUNT ONE: BREACH OF CONTRACT

- 19. Apache incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1-18 as if each is set forth fully herein.
- 20. The Policy is a valid and binding contract between Apache and GAIC, and GAIC has wrongly asserted that the Policy does not cover Apache's computer fraud loss as that coverage is defined in the Policy.
- 21. The unambiguous terms of the Policy provide that GAIC "will pay for loss of, and loss from damager to, money, securities and other property resulting directly from the use of any computer resulting directly from the use of any computer to fraudulently cause a transfer of that property from inside the premises or banking premises." The loss Apache suffered resulted directly from the use of a computer to fraudulently cause a transfer of Apache's funds from inside the premises of RBS to a place outside the premises of RBS—Co-Op Bank. Apache transferred money to the fraudulent Co-Op Bank account as a direct result of the fraudulent email Apache received. Apache would not have transferred the funds to the fraudulent account in the absence of the email, and the purpose of the email was to cause Apache to transfer funds to the fraudulent account.
- 22. Alternatively, to the extent the terms and provisions of the Policy are ambiguous, they must be construed in favor of the insured, Apache.
- 23. Apache has fully performed its obligations under the Policy, including all conditions precedent. GAIC breached the policy by refusing to cover this loss.

- 24. As a result of GAIC's breach, Apache suffered damages in the amount of £1,573,454.96 or, roughly, \$2.4 million, minus the \$1 million deductible. Under the Policy, GAIC is entitled to value the loss in British pounds or in U.S. dollars at the date of discovery of loss, which is May 3, 2013. Apache hereby pleads for either at GAIC's election.
- 25. As a result of its denial of coverage under the Policy, GAIC has waived any and all Policy conditions as defenses to Apache's claim.

VII. ATTORNEYS' FEES AND INTEREST

- 26. Apache incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 25.
- 27. By reason of the wrongful conduct of Defendant GAIC, Apache has become obliged to retain the undersigned to bring this action. Apache is therefore entitled to recover and seeks herein its reasonable and necessary attorneys' fees incurred in prosecuting this action and any appeal under Chapter 38 of the Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code and other applicable provisions of Texas law, including the Texas Insurance Code.
- 28. Defendant GAIC has failed to comply with the requirements of Chapter 542 of the Texas Insurance Code. Defendant GAIC is, therefore, obligated to pay Apache eighteen percent (18%) per annum of the amount of Apache's claim, together with reasonable attorneys' fees.
- 29. On August 22, 2013, Apache presented GAIC with a written proof of loss, and GAIC has failed to pay Apache's claim. In addition, Apache presented its claim to GAIC in writing on January 10, 2014, and GAIC has failed to pay the amount owed.
 - 30. In addition, Apache seeks pre- and post-judgment interest at the lawful rates.

VIII. PRAYER

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Plaintiff respectfully prays that judgment be entered in its favor, that it recover costs, and for such other and further relief to which it may be justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

VINSON & ELKINS L.L.P.

By: /s/ Patrick W. Mizell
Patrick W. Mizell
State Bar No. 14233980
Deborah C. Milner
State Bar No. 24065761
Vinson & Elkins L.L.P.
1001 Fannin Street, Suite 2300
Houston, Texas 77002
Telephone: 713.758.2932
Telecopy: 713.615.5912

Nancy R. Kornegay State Bar No. 24032641 BROWN & KORNEGAY LLP 2777 Allen Parkway, Suite 977 Houston, Texas 77019 [Tel.] (713) 528-3700 [Fax] (713) 528-3701

ATTORNEYS FOR APACHE CORPORATION

CIVIL CASE INFORMATION SHEET (Rec. 233)

		CAUSE NUMBER IFOR	CLIRA (SEOSIY).			OURT HOR	CLERK USE O	VLY):) in the contract of the contr
	A civ	d case information sheet no	Corporation v. Great Amer g. John Sauth v. Ali American learns as be completed and submitted who	og Co. In s en an offi	e Mary Ann Jones. In the tennal petition or applic	Matter of the E. ation is filed	to miniate a r	EW CIVIL	, family law, probate, or mental
		s case or when a post-judym ne of filing.	ent petition for modification or mo	stism for e	inforcement is filed in	a family law	case. The inf	onnatio	n should be the host available in
	1. Co	ifict information for perso	n completing rase information sh	eet	Names of parties is	case:			or entity completing sheet is:
	Name	•	Email.		Plaintiff(s) Petitione	1(%):	IC	Pra Sc	y for Plaintiff Petitioner Plaintiff Petitioner
	Patrio	k W. Mizell	pmizell@velaw.com		Apache Corporal	tion			-D Ascally
	Addre		Telephone		£ 4.75 0.00	**************************************	L.	tion.	to a departe parameter (outractive to the entertainment of the second spectrum of the secon
		& Eliums, 1001 Famour, \$1 , Suite 250	00 10 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 0	numerous se	A Amorto	p			Parties in Child Support Case
	City/S	tate Zip:	Fax.		Delendant(s) Respon			ustodial	iacd
- District Clerk y	Hidus	ton, TX 77002	713-615-5912	,,	Great American In	isurance Coi	W-100-100-100-100-100-100-100-100-100-10	on Custo	odial Parent.
ct		tuce)	State Bar No.			the state of the s	-		
stri	18556 SHAN	wax	14233980			*19:3/ A4; A**	P ₁	esumed	Fasher
ر د -	SIS	ENNER OF THE CONTRACTOR	4	e Normania	(Attach addition) page as	accepted to our a	il paries]	- * -2 * "P%	Was in the case of
iel unt	20	cate erect pe, or ideality	the most important issue in the e	a sp / setec	I to 115 to 115. The same and the state of t	1	ARMEN ENGINEERS	Fami	dy Law
Car		Contract	Initias or Dantage		Real Property	Marri	age Relations	hia	Post-judgment Actions (non-Title IV-D)
rris Irris	9 E	ontracy	the most important issue in the c Civil Injury or Daninge Assault Battery Communion Defauation	LIE	uncht Domain ndemasson	Anm			☐ Enforcement ☐ Modification — Curandy
さ当	j 📆	Debt Contract	Detamation	□Pn	tition	Divorce			☐Modification — Other
	Q	row Contract rand Misrepresentation Other Debt Contract	Accounting	Utr	rspass to Try Tule		ith Children o Children	ŀ	Title IV-D [Entoreonem Modification]
	Fores	usure	□Legal □Medical	Dor	her Property:				□Patemity □Receptocals (UIFSA)
		lome Equity—Expedited Other Foreclasure	Other Professional Liability						Support Order
	<u>ර</u> ා	nchise mince	Motor Vehicle Accident	R	elated to Criminal Masters	Oth	er Family L	198	Parent-Child Relationship
	La	dlord Tenant -Competition	Product Liability		parktion is ment Nia		sice Foreign ement		Adoption Adoption with Terromation
l	(T)ai	tnership	☐Asbestos Silica	□Nc	n-Disclosure	□Hab	ess Curpus re Chause	***	Child Protection Child Support
	4	er Contract:	Other Product Liability List Product	W	nt of Habeas Corpus	Prot	ective Order	Kinnikan	Custody or Visuation
	~		Other Injury or Dennage:	1	e-indicational her	of N	ioval of Disab Sinority	thities	Gestational Parenting Grandparent Access
	20					□ Oth	er.		Parentage Paternity Termination of Parental
		Employment	provide a second	r Civil				1	Rights [Other Parent Chiki.
	Re	eritrination Libration	Administrative Appeal Antitrust Unfor	printing and	wyer Discipline quetano Testanony				
		mination rkers Compensation	Competition Code Violations	-	cupiles Stock atous Interference				
		per Employment:	Foreign Judgment	O	her	-		1	
		A CONTRACTOR AND			and the second s	1			
	Dī.	Kar Approval	Probate/Wills/Intestate Adminis	viration	econ make with the second	Mental Heal Guardians	hipAdult		
		se Delinquency ther Tax	□ Dependent Administration □ Independent Administration	n on		Guardians O'Mental Ho	drip – Minoc calch		
			Other Estate Proceedings			Other:		and the second	
	3. Ind	licute procedure or remedy	l v, d applicable many select more th	ian I)s					
		ppeal from Municipal or Jus rbitration-related	tice Court □ Declar □ Gamis		(HCH)		Prejudge Protectiv		nedy
		itachment ill of Review	Unterplant Control				□Receiver □Sequestri		
	DC	entionari lass Action	☐ Manda	tous.		Temporary Restraining Order Injunction			
	4. Im	Heats damages tought (de	not relect if it is a family law case)	i di manani K					
		es than \$100,000, including ess than \$100,000 and non-n	damages of any kind, penalties, co nonetary relief	ists, exper	ases, pre-judgment iste	rest, and aftor	rney fees		
	Πo	ver \$100, 000 bus not more over \$200,000 but not more t	dun 5200,000						
		ver \$1,000,000					that is made with a latter	**************************************	

1/10/2014 4:25:08 PM Chris Daniel - District Clerk

CIVIL PROCESS REQUEST

1/15/2014 2:58:13 PM Chris Daniel - District Clerk Harris County Envelope No: 219408 By: ROBICHEAUX, PAMELA G

FOR EACH PARTY SERVED YOU MUST FURNISH ONE (1) COPY OF THE PLEADING FOR WRITS FURNISH TWO (2) COPIES OF THE PLEADING PER PARTY TO BE SERVED

CASE NUMBER: 2014-01190 CUI	RRENT COURT: Harris County District, 165th Judicial District
TYPE OF INSTRUMENT TO BE SERVED (See Reverse For Types):	Original Petition
FILE DATE OF MOTION:	Month/ Day/ Year
SERVICE TO BE ISSUED ON (Please List Exactly As The Name A 1. NAME: Great American Insurance Company ADDRESS: CT Corporation System, 350 N. St. Paul AGENT, (if applicable): TYPE OF SERVICE/PROCESS TO BE ISSUED (see reverse for specify SERVICE BY (check one): ATTORNEY PICK-UP CIVIL PROCESS SERVER - Authorized Person to Picture Mail PUBLICATION: Type of Publication: COURTHOUSE DOO	Month/ Day/ Year ppears In The Pleading To Be Served): Street, Dallas, Texas 75201 ic type): CONSTABLE ck-up: Phone: CERTIFIED MAIL R, or UR CHOICE:

2. NAME:	
ADDRESS:	
AGENT, (if applicable):	
TYPE OF SERVICE/PROCESS TO BE ISSUED (see reverse for specif	ic type):
SERVICE BY (check one): ATTORNEY PICK-UP	CONSTABLE
☐ CIVIL PROCESS SERVER - Authorized Person to P	ick-up: Phone:
☐ MAIL ☐	CERTIFIED MAIL
	R, or UR CHOICE:
ATTORNEY (OR ATTORNEY'S AGENT) REQUESTING SERVICE	
NAME:	
MAILING ADDRESS:	
PHONE NUMBER: area code phone number	FAX NUMBER: area code fax number
EMAIL ADDRESS:	

SERVICE REQUESTS WHICH CANNOT BE PROCESSED BY THIS OFFICE WILL BE HELD FOR 30 DAYS PRIOR TO CANCELLATION. FEES WILL BE REFUNDED ONLY UPON REQUEST, OR AT THE DISPOSITION OF THE CASE. SERVICE REQUESTS MAY BE REINSTATED UPON APPROPRIATE ACTION BY THE PARTIES.

INSTRUMENTS TO BE SERVED:	PROCESS TYPES:
(Fill In Instrument Sequence Number, i.e. 1st, 2nd, etc.)	
	NON WRIT:
ORIGINAL PETITION	CITATION
AMENDED PETITION	ALIAS CITATION
SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION	PLURIES CITATION
	SECRETARY OF STATE CITATION
	COMMISSIONER OF INSURANCE
COUNTERCLAIM	HIGHWAY COMMISSIONER
AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM	CITATION BY PUBLICATION
SUPPLEMENTAL COUNTERCLAIM	NOTICE
SOLI EELINEI III EE SOUTH EI TEAN	SHORT FORM NOTICE
CROSS-ACTION:	
AMENDED CROSS-ACTION	PRECEPT (SHOW CAUSE)
SUPPLEMENTAL CROSS-ACTION	RULE 106 SERVICE
SOLI ELIVIENTAL CROSS-ACTION	1022 100 021(122
THIRD-PARTY PETITION:	SUBPOENA
AMENDED THIRD-PARTY PETITION	555. 65. 11.
SUPPLEMENTAL THIRD-PARTY PETITION	WRITS:
SUFFLEMENTAL THIRD-LART LETTION	ATTACHMENT (PROPERTY)
INTERVENTION:	ATACHMENT (WITNESS)
AMENDED INTERVENTION	ATTACHMENT (PERSON)
SUPPLEMENTAL INTERVENTION	ATTACHNENT (LERGOTT)
SUPPLEMENTAL INTERVENTION	
INTERPLEADER	CERTIORARI
AMENDED INTERPLEADER	02
SUPPLEMENTAL INTERPLEADER	EXECUTION
SOFFLEIMENTAL INTERCEDADER	EXECUTION AND ORDER OF SALE
	LABOUTION THE ORDER OF SALE
	GARNISHMENT BEFORE JUDGMENT
INJUNCTION	GARNISHMENT AFTER JUDGMENT
Moneron	
MOTION TO MODIFY	HABEAS CORPUS
SHOW CAUSE ORDER	INJUNCTION
	TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER	
	PROTECTIVE ORDER (FAMILY CODE)
	PROTECTIVE ORDER (CIVIL CODE)
BILL OF DISCOVERY:	
ORDER TO:	POSSESSION (PERSON)
(specify)	POSSESSION (PROPERTY)
MOTION TO:	
(specify)	
	SCIRE FACIAS
	SEQUESTRATION
	SUPERSEDEAS

Harris County Docket Sheet

2014-01190

COURT: 165th

FILED DATE: 1/10/2014

CASE TYPE: BREACH OF CONTRACT



APACHE CORPORATION

Attorney: MIZELL, PATRICK W.

VS.

GREAT AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY

	Docket Sheet Entries				
Date	Comment				